

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Procedural background 1

ii. Law And Argument 4

 A. Rule 59(E) And Rule 60(B) Motions Are Appropriate To Rectify Obvious Errors Of Law. 4

 B. Discretionary Dismissal of the Declaratory Judgment Action in Deference to a TTAB Cancellation Proceeding was Predicated on an Obvious Error of Law. 4

 i) Federalism and Comity (Trejo Factors 1 & 7): It was legal error for the Court to conclude the TTAB proceeding is a venue in which all of the matters in controversy may be fully litigated. 5

 ii) Fairness (Trejo Factors 2–4): It was legal error for the Court to conclude that the mere filing of the declaratory judgment action by Plaintiffs constituted improper anticipatory litigation or otherwise abusive “forum shopping.” 13

 iii) Efficiency (Trejo Factors 5–6): It was legal error to conclude that maintaining the declaratory judgment action would result in duplicative litigation. 14

III. Conclusion 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Industries, Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1293 (2015)	11, 12
<i>Brillhart v. Excess Ins. Co. of Am.</i> , 316 U.S. 491, 495 (1942)	6
<i>Deniece Design, LLC v. Braun</i> , 953 F. Supp. 2d 765, 779 (S.D. Tex. 2013).....	2
<i>Goya Foods, Inc. v. Tropicana Products, Inc.</i> , 846 F.2d 848 (2d Cir. 1988).....	10, 13
<i>Hill v. McDermott, Inc.</i> , 827 F.2d 1040, 1043 (5th Cir. 1987)	4
<i>Huntwise, Inc. v. Mojo Sportswear Company, et al.</i> , No. 6:13-cv-00912 (W.D. La. - Lafayette Div.) (Judge Doherty, presiding)	2
<i>Mercury Motor Express, Inc. v. Brinke</i> , 475 F.2d 1086, 1091–92 (5th Cir. 1973)	10
<i>Officeware Corp. v. Dropbox, Inc.</i> , No. 3:11-CV-1448-L, 2012 WL 3262760, at *2-4 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 10, 2012)	10
<i>PHC v. Pioneer Healthcare</i> , 75 F.3d 75, 80 (1st Cir. 1996)	6, 10, 11
<i>Rhoades v. Avon Prods., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2007)	10, 11, 14
<i>Rosenzweig v. Azurix Corp.</i> , 332 F.3d 854, 863 (5th Cir. 2003)	4
<i>Shepherd v. Int’l Paper Co.</i> , 372 F.3d 326, 328 n.1 (5th Cir. 2004)	4
<i>Sherwin-Williams Co. v. Holmes County</i> , 343 F.2d 383 (5 th Cir. 2003).....	5, 6, 14
<i>St. Paul Insurance Co. v. Trejo</i> , 39 F.3d. 585 (5th Cir. 1994).....	3, 5, 13, 14
<i>Star Indus., Inc. v. Bacardi & Co. Ltd.</i> , 412 F.3d 373, 386 (2d Cir. 2005)	8
<i>Templet v. Hydrochem Inc.</i> , 367 F.3d 473, 479 (5th Cir. 2004)	4

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 2201	1
28 U.S.C. § 2201(a)	3, 5
28 U.S.C. § 2202.....	1

Secondary Sources

3 *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 20:53 (4th ed.)..... 6, 7

6 *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 32:100 (4th ed.)..... 7

6 *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 32:102 (4th ed.)..... 8

6 *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 32:98 (4th ed.)..... 12

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2)..... 2, 4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(3)..... 2, 4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)..... 2, 4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)..... 2, 4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) 4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)..... 4